DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 746 EA 015 599

AUTHOR	Lemon, Donald K.; And Others
TITLE	The Elementary School Principalship in North Dakota, No. 18.
INSTITUTION	North Dakota Univ., Grand Forks. Bureau of Educational Research and Services.
PUB DATE	Nov 82
NOTE	74p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications, Bureau of Educational Research and Services, Box 8158, University Station, Grand Forks, ND 58202 ($3.00; $2.00 each for quantity orders of 25 or more copies).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; Demography; Elementary Education; *Elementary Schools; *Institutional Characteristics; *Leadership Styles; *Principals; School Organization; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	North Dakota

ABSTRACT

Three general aspects of the elementary principalship in North Dakota were examined in this study: the principal as a person and as a professional; the school and setting in which the principal works; and the principal's leadership style, style range, and adaptability. Self-report instruments were sent by mail to 75 randomly selected male principals and 75 randomly selected female principals agreeing to participate in the study. Regarding personal and professional information, over 20 findings were uncovered, including the fact that female principals were found in smaller schools and communities, most female principals were under 25 or over 56, and most of the principals with children at home were male. Regarding setting, findings were related to school organizational patterns; the characteristics of students, staff, community, facilities, and programs; perceived problems; and changes occurring in the school. Over 51 findings were reported, including that the most frequent grade pattern was K-6, and that principals feel they do not have enough guidance counselors and that their schools are too small to offer a wide range of programs. Regarding leadership, the study reported a number of findings, including that 58 percent of subjects had a leadership style demonstrating a high concern for both task and relationships. (JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN NORTH DAKOTA

Donald K. Lemon
Isabel Hovel
Jeanette Lindquist
Ann Porter

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry L. Bailey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 015 599

Published by the Bureau of Educational Research and Services
University of North Dakota
No. 18, November 1982
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58202

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN NORTH DAKOTA

by
Donald K. Lemon
Isabel Hovel
Jeanette Lindquist
Ann Porter

Published by the
Bureau of Educational Research and Services
Center for Teaching and Learning
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota

With Endorsement From
The North Dakota Association of
Elementary School Principals

November 1982

FOREWORD

The North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals is pleased to be able to co-sponsor this monograph with the Bureau of Educational Research and Services, University of North Dakota. Copies of this monograph will be disseminated to all members of the North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals.

This is the first real in-depth study of the North Dakota elementary principalship completed within the past decade.

The monograph is intended to inform interested readers, to give a better understanding and awareness of the role of the North Dakota elementary principal, and to enhance the importance of having an elementary principal in each school. It confirms what elementary principals have been saying about their work in terms of complexity, increased difficulty, professional and personal rewards and responsibilities. It also illustrates the many changes (subtle and otherwise) in the role of the elementary principal that have occurred within the past few years.

A special thanks to Dr. Don Lemon and his associates at the Center for Teaching and Learning for their work in making this information available.

Wayne Peterson, President Elect
North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals

CHAPTER I

WHY AND HOW THE STUDY WAS CONDUCTED

Background of the Study

Education is widely viewed by the American public as a key element in the future success of the youth of this country. This same public expects the school to improve the quality of society, reduce problems in the society, and inculcate the cultural values of the society. These goals are expected to be accomplished with efficiency and economy.

There are a group of men and women--the principals of America's schools--entrusted with the leadership for accomplishing these goals. The principals in North Dakota face a special set of problems which makes their already-difficult leadership responsibility even more complex. Many schools are experiencing a declining enrollment coupled with inflation and soaring energy costs. Other schools, particularly in the oil and coal development areas of the state, are experiencing expanding enrollments calling for capital expenditures. These schools are also facing the effects of inflation and energy costs. In both situations local taxpayers are demanding that school boards maintain or reduce the tax burden because they, too, are experiencing increased financial pressures. It is in this sort of climate that the elementary school principal must address the needs of pupils, citizens, and teachers. To put the best possible face on this situation it could be called a challenge and that would clearly be a gross understatement.

Need for the Study

If leadership for the accomplishment of major societal goals is to be entrusted to individuals who carry out a particular role, it behooves all citizens to know and understand as much as possible about those persons. Elementary school principals are certainly such a group. Yet the last major study, on a national scale, of elementary school principals was conducted in 1978 by Pharis and Zakariya (1979). The most recent study of the elementary principalship in North Dakota was conducted by Zimmerman (1968). The Pharis and Zakariya study is so broad in scope that it is difficult to glean a great deal of data which are especially helpful in a rural state like North Dakota. The Zimmerman study only dealt with Level I and Level II schools and it was done a long time ago.

In order for interested citizens to make wise decisions it is necessary that they have current, accurate, and relevant data. Thus, in order to make such decisions as whether the elementary principal is properly trained, is adequately responsive to the needs of pupils and teachers, is satisfactorily responsive in leadership situations, and the like, the appropriate data must be obtained and communicated. It seems apparent that groups and individuals like the legislature, the school boards association and individual school boards, the school administrators associations and individual administrators, the parent-teacher associations, the teachers associations and individual school faculties, the Department of Public Instruction, the school administrator preparation institutions, and the principals themselves would need such data for decision making.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to develop descriptive data about the principal as a person; the principal as a professional; the school in which the principal works; the setting (including community) in which the principal works; and the principal's style, range, and adaptability in order to provide a clearer understanding of the elementary principalship in North Dakota. The findings of this study were intended to be helpful to elementary school principals in particular, but also to others in the larger education community and to the citizenry of the state. It was the fervent hope of the investigators that the study would help to cause actions which would strengthen the elementary school principalship and thereby increase the quality of educational experiences provided for boys and girls in North Dakota and perhaps beyond.

Delimitations

The study was delimited in the following ways:

1. The sample included 75 men and 75 women principals, all from North Dakota.

2. Two of the three instruments were developed by the writers. These instruments were not tested for validity or reliability and they may have omitted important demographic data or questions of interest.

3. All data reported were based on the perceptions, information, and recall of the principals in the sample.

Definitions

For the purposes of this study the following terms and their definitions are applicable:

Elementary principal: Those persons in each school designated by the board of education or superintendent as elementary principal. The position=

was not defined in regard to holding an appropriate certificate.

Prototype: An accepted model or standard.

Prototypic data: Data that served as a description of the prototype.

Elementary school: Schools containing some or all of the grades kindergarten through eight.

Specialist: Person with special training in a specified area such as speech, counseling, etc.

School organization: Patterns of activity or arrangements of groups of students for learning.

Program of instruction: The organized educative activity of the school.

Leadership style: A term used to describe the consistent pattern of behaviors used by a leader when he or she was working with and through others toward goal achievement.

Leadership range: A term used to describe the extent to which a leader varied his or her leadership style from one situation to another.

Style adaptability: A term which referred to the degree a leader's behavior was appropriate to a particular leadership situation according to Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) situational leadership theory.

Dominant leadership style: A dominant leadership style was the one for which the most responses were selected by the respondent on the LEAD Self (Hersey and Blanchard 1973) and presumably would be used most often in the settings in which he or she finds himself or herself.

Supporting leadership style: A supporting leadership style was one which was not dominant but was selected two or more times by the respondent on the LEAD Self and would be used when the dominant style seemed to be ineffective or inappropriate by the leader.

Leadership: Working with and/or through others to accomplish goals.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made regarding the study:

1. The sample was representative of the male and female participants in North Dakota.

2. The participants were honest and accurate in their responses to all the instruments.

3. The instruments used yielded valid and reliable data for describing the elementary school principalship in North Dakota.

Questions of Interest

1. What is a prototypic description of the elementary school principal based on personal attributes?

2. What is a prototypic description of the elementary school principal based on professional attributes?

3. What differences in prototypic description occur when comparisons are made between sizes of schools, kinds of locations of schools, and sexes of principals?

4. What is the current description of elementary schools and school settings based on

   (a) organizational patterns?

   (b) conflicts?

   (c) recent changes?

   (d) students?

   (e) staff?

   (f) decision making?

   (g) programs?

   (h) authority of the principal?

   (i) job satisfaction?

5. Is there a relationship between a principal's sex, age, education, community, teacher's sex, time devoted to principal duties, organization of the school, leadership training, experience, and his or her leadership style, range, and adaptability?

How the Study was Conducted

Three Master of Education degree students--Isabel Hovel, Jeanette Lindquist, and Ann Porter--under the direction of their advisor, Don Lemon, undertook a comprehensive study of the elementary principalship in North Dakota during the spring and summer of 1982. The study was divided into three parts and the investigators used the same population sample in all of their studies. Participants for the study were selected on the basis of a stratified random sample of elementary school principals chosen from a printout of elementary school principals provided by the Department of Public Instruction. There were 548 elementary schools listed on the printout. Of the 548 elementary schools listed there were 131 schools in which no principal was named. There were 51 names which were duplicated because the principal was designated as serving more than one school. Those schools having no principal named and the duplicate names were eliminated from the population. Of the 366 remaining names, 126 were identified by given name as women. A sample of 75 women was selected randomly from this pool. Of the 366 names, 240 were identified as men on the basis of given name and 75 were randomly selected from this pool.

Commitment was sought for participation in the study from the 150 selected principals. For those who chose not to participate, replacements were randomly selected until 150 principals (75 males and 75 females) had agreed to participate in the study.

Instruments Used in the Study

An instrument was developed by Isabel Hovel and Don Lemon to gather demographic data about principals. A second instrument used by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Institute of Education (NIE) was modified by Jeanette Lindquist and Don Lemon to gather data about the schools and the settings in which principals function (Abramowitz and Tennenbaum 1978). A third instrument--the Leader Effectiveness & Adaptability Description (Hersey and Blanchard 1973)--was selected by Ann Porter and Don Lemon to gather data about the leadership style, range, and adaptability of principals. These instruments were administered to the sample population in the spring of 1982 with assistance from the Bureau of Educational Research and Services of the University of North Dakota.

Data Gathering and Tabulation

On February 4, 1982, the two survey instruments plus the LEAD Self, along with a letter of instructions and a stamped, self-addressed envelope, were mailed to the 150 persons selected as the sample population for the studies. The instruments were returned between February 9, 1982, and April 5, 1982. During the period when the instruments were being returned, follow-up letters and telephone contacts were made to urge participants to return their instruments and/or to seek clarification of responses which had been made by individual respondents. The Bureau of Educational Research and Services assisted the investigators by providing postage, envelopes, and printing costs for the instruments.

Richard Landry, Center for Teaching and Learning Professor of Measurement and Research, assisted the investigators in coding the data so that it could be transferred from the instruments to Fortran Coding Forms. The

writers were assisted by Dr. Judy Minier (a UND faculty member), Ms. Cari Guemple-Stenseth (a UND graduate student), and Sharon Fields and Jeanette Prax (secretaries) in tabulating the data as the instruments were returned.

Analysis of the Data

The statistical treatment of the data was done at the University of North Dakota Computer Center using the IBM 370/158 computer. The computer programs utilized were from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent 1975). Richard Landry wrote the procedures to access the computer and to instruct the computer to make the appropriate tests.

Statistical applications and treatments included frequency distributions, chi square tests for k independent samples, Kruskal-Wallis one-way analyses of variance, analyses of variance, and Pearson product moment correlation coefficients. In those instances where tests of significance were made the writers chose the .05 level as adequate for rejecting a hypothesis of no difference.

The following chapters report the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the investigators in regard to the personal and professional description of North Dakota principals; the school and the school setting in which principals carry out their roles; and the leadership style, range, and adaptability which principals bring to their work. This information should be of profound interest to principals. It should also be of special interest to others in the education profession, especially to district school officials and to members of the state education agency who can offer leadership in shaping the future of the principalship. In addition, school board members and legislators who have authority over policy and law, respectively, will likely have a great interest in these data.

CHAPTER II

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ABOUT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN NORTH DAKOTA

Schools, like society in general, are undergoing a process of rapid change. Factors such as national and local economies, social changes, birthrate changes, and changes in educational thought all affect schools and their relationship to society. School leaders, especially building principals, face growing pressures as a result of these factors.

Schools also find themselves in an economic bind. One factor contributing to this bind is the inflationary rise in costs of running and maintaining a school system. These rising costs include energy costs, staff salaries, books and supplies needed for the classroom, food and supplies needed for the lunchroom, and building maintenance supplies. Another factor is that the amount of money available for operating schools is being maintained at the same level or decreased due to the reluctance of the public to increase mill levies and to factors affecting state aid, such as lower birthrates and greater family mobility. These factors affect whether programs can even be offered in the school and, if they are, the level of implementation which can be accomplished. These factors also affect the organization of the schools in that many school boards feel compelled to consolidate with other districts.

The operation of schools is becoming a more and more complex process. Accordingly, the role and function of the principal are also becoming

increasingly more complex as the needs of the school, the staff, the parents, the students, and the community are addressed.

A survey instrument of 30 items was sent by mail to 150 elementary principals in North Dakota. These principals were selected by a stratified random sampling process from all the elementary principals in North Dakota. There were 12 questions pertaining to personal information and 16 questions pertaining to professional information. Two other questions were for the purpose of identification. Each of these variables were then compared in relationship to sex, type of community, and size of the school. A relationship of .05 or less was selected as the point of significance for rejecting a null hypothesis when tested with the chi square test.

The purpose of this study was to develop prototypic data which would be descriptive of the elementary principal in North Dakota during the 1981-82 school year. The study and its findings were then to be used to better provide a comprehensive overview of the principalship in North Dakota. The study could then be used by principals and other related school personnel as a resource guide and a basis from which to work in the planning and decision-making process about improving the elementary principalship with a view to positively impacting the quality of education provided to the children of the state.

The following instrument was sent to the sample population. The blanks have been filled with the frequencies and percentages on the basis of the participants' responses. In a few places tables have been interjected for clarity. In some cases a few of the sample population did not respond. The number of these instances is indicated by NA (Not Answered).

The North Dakota Elementary School Principalship
Study: Demographic Data

DIRECTIONS: Please answer every question! Be sure to check both sides of the paper. Please give only one response to each item. Choose the "best" answer--the one that most nearly or appropriately fits you. Thank-you.

1. Name _____

2. Name of school district _____

Personal Data

3. Your sex: Male 75 (50%) Female 75 (50%) Total 150 (100%)

4. Your age:
   under 26 5 (3.3%)
   26-35 .. 41 (27.3%)
   36-45 .. 48 (32.0%)
   46-55 .. 32 (21.3%)
   56-65 22 (14.7%)
   66-over 2 (1.3%)

5. Marital status: single 28 (18.7%) married 112 (74.7%)
   divorced 3 (2.0%) separated 1 (0.7%) widowed 6 (4.0%)

6. Are you a parent: yes 110 (73.3%) no 40 (26.7%)

7. Do you have children who still live at home: yes 88 (59.5%) no 60 (40.5%)

8. Number with children:
   under school age 24 NA 1 parent
   school age 72
   adult children 52
   total children 109 (see table 2)

9. Economic support: sole supporter of your family or self 47 (31.3%) NA 4
   spouse also has an income..... 97 (64.7%) NA 5

10. Do you also have financial support from sources other than the principalship? yes 82 (54.7%) no 65 (43.3%)

11. Salary for this school year:
    range $0 to $41,400
    for months of employment range 6 to 12 months
    salary/most frequent interval $15,000 to $18,000 (N = 23/15.3%)
    months/most frequent interval 10 months (N = 62/41.3%)

    Salary for principalship assignment:
    range $0 to $36,300
    salary/most frequent interval $24,100 to $27,000 (over 5% principalship) (N = 13/8.7%)

12. Where have you spent most of your life?
    In this city, town, or county..... 55 (36.9%) NA 1
    In this state outside this city, town, county.... 78 (52.3%)
    Outside this state, but in U.S. 16 (10.7%)
    In another country 0 (0.0%)

13. In what type of community have you spent most of your life?

In a rural setting or small farm community	68	(45.3%)
In small town (less than 10,000; not a suburb)	30	(20.0%)
Residential area of a medium city (10,000-100,000)	32	(21.3%)
Suburb of medium city	3	(2.0%)
Inner city of medium city	0	(0.0%)

NA 2

14. What is your ethnic background?

Negro 0 (0.0%) American Indian 4 (2.7%) Mexican-American 0 (0.0%)
Oriental 0 (0.0%) White 145 (96.7%) Other 1 (0.7%)

Professional Data

15. The highest earned college degree you hold is:

none	0	(0.0%)
less than 4-year degree	3	(2.0%)
Bachelor's Degree	65	(43.3%)
Master's Degree	72	(48.0%)
Professional or Specialist Degree	7	(4.7%)
Doctoral Degree	3	(2.0%)

16. Your major field of study at the undergraduate level was (if two, indicate most prominent):

Elementary Education	113	(75.3%)
Secondary Education	34	(22.7%)
Other	3	(2.0%)

17. What credential do you hold as an elementary principal: none 36 (24.0%)
Level III 20 (13.3%) Level II 35 (23.3%) Level I 55 (36.7%)
Other 3 (2.0%) NA 1

18. Did you receive specific training in leadership skills (which you could describe) in your preparation for the principalship?
yes 74 (49.3%) no 72 (48.0%) NA 3

19. When you received your current appointment to the principalship, were you working:

In the present school district	88	(58.7%)
In another school district	47	(31.3%)
Outside the education field	3	(2.0%)
In other activities (e.g., graduate school, military)	12	(8.0%)

20. Including the 1981-1982 school year, how long is your professional experience?

Years as principal of this school ..... NA 2
Years as principal in another school .....
Years as superintendent other than principal..
Years as an elementary classroom teacher .....
Years as a secondary classroom teacher .....
Years in other ..... (see table 3)

21. This year as elementary principal, what percentage of your time do you spend in that position?
100% (N = 52/34.7%) 0-20% (N = 51/34.0%)

What other professional position(s) do you hold and what percentage of time do you give to the position(s)? (For example: Superintendent, High School Principal, Classroom Teacher, etc.)

Position classroom teacher (N = 81/54.0%)

Position other administrator (N = 7/7.3%)

22. How important are the following school goals to you as principal (check one for each goal)?

Goals	Very	Moderate	Marginal	None
Teaching basic skills	141 (94.0%)	9 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Developing high moral standards and citizenship	131 (87.9%) NA 1	18 (12.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Teaching students to get along with others	130 (86.7%)	20 (13.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Developing individual responsibility for management of one's own learning	117 (78.5%) NA 1	30 (20.1%)	2 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Preparing students for the job market	39 (26.2%) NA 1	71 (47.[illegible]%)	36 (2.0%)	3 (2.0%)
Preparing students for junior high and high school	101 (67.3%)	38 (25.3%)	11 (7.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Developing aesthetic appreciation	53 (36.8%) NA 6	77 (53.5%)	14 (9.7%)	0 (0.0%)

23. How much influence do you believe you have in school building level decision making?

great deal 98 (65.3%)
moderate amount 33 (22.0%)
small amount 10 (6.7%)
practically none 9 (6.0%)

24. How much influence do you believe you have in district level decision making?

great deal ..... 30 (20.7%) NA 5
moderate amount 59 (40.7%)
small amount 17 (25.3%)
practically none 19 (13.1%)

25. How many schools do you serve as principal?

one 127 (85.2%) two 18 (12.1%) more than two 4 (2.7%) NA 1

26. In how many separate school buildings are these schools?

one 102 (75.0%) two 28 (20.6%) more than two 6 (4.4%) NA 14

27. Are you a member of NDAESP? yes 81 (55.5%) no 64 (42.7%) NA 5

28. Are you a member of NAESP? yes 55 (36.7%) no 86 (57.3%) NA 9

29. Are you a member of NDCSA? yes 52 (34.7%) no 91 (60.7%) NA 7

30. Please add any comments you believe to be important.

As the writer reviewed the findings of the study, there were a number of interesting factors that seemed to emerge. Based on these factors which concern the personal and professional characteristics of the elementary principal in North Dakota, the following descriptions were developed and conclusions were drawn.

A significant relationship existed between the sex of the principal and the type of community and the size of the school. Males were more likely to be found in towns of 2,000 or more and in schools with larger enrollments. Females were more likely to be found in rural communities and smaller schools. Some possible reasons for this might have been that women have less experience and education and were therefore more attractive to smaller school districts, where they could be employed for smaller salaries. Another possible reason could have been reluctance on the part of hiring personnel to employ a woman with less training and experience in an urban administrative position where most responsibilities are perceived to exist. It may also have been that women prefer teaching/administrative kinds of roles in order to maintain closer contacts with children. Possibly, it may have been that smaller schools employ wives of local businessmen and farmers at a salary that is lower than would be needed to attract nonlocal persons to the school district. Thus, as vacancies occurred in the principalship a local female teacher seemed likely to have been named to the position. These factors are shown in table 1.

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY DATA COMPARING NORTH DAKOTA ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS ON THE BASIS OF SEX WITH THE TYPE OF COMMUNITY AND SIZE OF SCHOOL

Absolute Frequency
Percent

Category		Type of Community		Size of School					
Sex	Total	Urban	Rural	0-50	51-100	101-150	151-200	201-300	301+
Male	75	39	35	6	5	10	9	14	31
	50.0	26.1	23.3	4.0	3.3	6.7	6.0	9.3	20.7
Female	75	20	53	31	17	5	10	7	5
	50.0	13.4	35.4	20.7	11.3	3.3	6.7	4.7	3.3
TOTAL	150	59	88	37	22	15	19	21	36
	100.0	39.3	58.7	24.7	14.7	10.0	12.7	14.0	24.0

Type of Community $\chi^2 = 19.92873$ with df = 7, $p < .01$

Size of School $\chi^2 = 46.26770$ with df = 5, $p < .001$

A significant relationship existed between the age of the principal and the sex of the principal, type of community, and size of school. The most frequently reported age group--36 to 45--was more likely to be male in a larger school and the community slightly more likely to be rural. Females outnumbered males only in the age groups below 25 and over 56. Some reasons for this may have been due to longer years of teaching, child rearing, and other endeavors before going into the principalship on the part of female educators. Fewer males in the higher age intervals may have been due to the greater number of male principals going into central office positions. The age differences may have been due, in part, to the responsibilities a "middle-aged" mother had to her children on the part of female principals. The female teacher/principal may not have worked during the years when the children were small. If she did work it seemed likely that she would take only that amount of schooling needed to keep her credential intact. Time to pursue concentrated studies needed for higher- level administrative certification apparently would not be available until the children were older. Another factor may have been the tendency for female educators to be reluctant to take the required courses needed to qualify as an administrator. This may have been due to the feeling that the job opportunities were not probable. (In the more recent past, there were indications that the number of female educators in Educational Administration programs may be increasing as were, apparently, job opportunities.) Mobility could also be a factor since female principals would be frequently restricted to the location of their husbands' employment. Of all the age-group categories only the 46 to 55 age group was more likely to be found in urban communities. This may have been due to upward mobility to larger towns where the principal had accrued education and experience. The principal in this setting had greater responsibility and a greater amount of time was spent

in conducting the duties of the principal.

Of the 150 principals, 112 were married and 28 were single. Ten other principals were without a spouse due to divorce, separation, or death. The larger number of both male and female principals were married. Of the 150 principals, 110 were parents. Of the principals who were parents, 88 still had children at home. Most of the principals with children at home were male. This probably reflects the education and work patterns of female principals during the years when the children were small.

Of the 109 principals who were parents that reported children age groups, the principals with children in the first two categories (under school age and school age) were more likely to be male. The principals with adult-age children were most likely to be female. This, too, reflects the education and working patterns of female principals in relation to their family responsibilities. The frequencies of parents reporting children and their age categories are shown in table 2.

In the matter of financial support, 47 principals reported being sole supporters of their families. Twenty-eight of these were single and 10 were without spouses due to divorce, separation, or loss of spouse through death. Of the 112 who were married, 97 had spouses who worked. Eighty-two principals had other financial resources. This was probably due to the need for the family to work together to combat the effects of inflation.

A significant relationship existed between the salary of the principal and the sex of the principal and type of community. The most frequently reported salaries were in the $15,100-$18,000 interval. The male principals were more likely to receive a total salary of over $18,000 and the female principals more likely to receive a salary under that figure. Male principals were found in all intervals. Female principals were not found in intervals above $32,000. The range ran from $0-$41,400. The $0 figure was

TABLE 2

REPORTED FREQUENCIES OF PRINCIPALS WITH CHILDREN AND THEIR AGE CATEGORIES

Number of Children	With Children Under School Age	With School Age Children	With Adult Children	Total With Children
0	85 77.9	37 33.9	57 52.3	
1	15 13.8	26 23.9	15 13.3	15 13.8
2	5 4.6	32 29.4	14 12.8	39 35.8
3	4 3.7	11 10.1	12 11.0	31 28.4
4	0 0.0	2 1.8	8 7.3	14 12.8
5	0 0.0	1 0.9	2 1.8	6 5.5
6	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.9
7	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.9
8	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.9	0 0.0
9	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.9
10	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.9
TOTAL	24 22.0	72 66.0	52 47.7	109 100.0

based on the fact that one principal in a private school donated her time. Part of this discrepancy was apparently due to differences in education, certification, and experience.

The most frequently reported salaries of principals in towns with a population over 2,000 were in the $27,100-$30,000 interval. The most frequently reported salaries of principals in towns with a population of less than 2,000 were in the $15,100-$18,000 interval. Tne role of the principal in the smaller school districts seemed to be secondary to the role as a classroom teacher. The principal in this circumstance may have been paid for the percentage of time devoted to the principalship. Other contributing factors apparently were such things as the availability (or unavailability) of monetary resources to the schools, effects of inflation, cutbacks resulting from declining enrollments, mobility of families, and other factors affecting finances of the schools. These factors affected most schools of all sizes and in all types of communities, but seemed to have had a more devastating impact on the more rural communities.

The salary interval most frequently reported in smaller schools was the $15,100-$18,000 interval. In larger schools the $24,100-$30,000 interval was most frequently reported. One needs to remember a larger school can be present in a smaller community and a small school can be located in a city. The most probable reasons for these findings were such factors as typically small teacher/student ratio, which likely increased the per student costs in smaller schools; the limited dollars available to rural schools through taxes or state aid; and overall financial impact caused by inflation. Factors such as more education and longer months of employment in larger schools would also have an effect.

A significant relationship existed between the months of employment and the sex of the principal, type of community, and size of the school. The

most typical length of time of employment for the principal was 10 months. The principal employed for 10 months was more likely to be male, in an urban community, and in a larger school. Those employed for nine months were more likely to be female, in rural communities, and in smaller schools. There were a number of possible factors contributing to this pattern, such as the location of the female in rural schools and the male in urban schools, the additional duties which might take the urban principal into summer school and coaching, and the need for more record keeping in larger schools.

A significant relationship was found to exist between the amount of salary attributable to the time spent in carrying out principalship duties and the sex of the principal, type of community, and size of the school. Male principals tended to receive more salary than female principals. Urban communities tended to pay more than rural communities. The salary was typically greater in larger schools. The likely reasons were varied and may have had to do with the amount of education, the amount of experience, the credential held, the financial situation in the school district, and the variance in duties.

The majority of the elementary principals surveyed spent most of their lives in North Dakota but not in the city, town, or county in which they are presently located. Most of these principals were male. Part of this may be caused by the greater mobility of the male principal. Overall, the pattern seemed to indicate that principals tended to work in a community similar in size to the community in which they spent most of their lives.

The North Dakota elementary principal was likely to be white. Principals of American Indian heritage were also represented. This was probably due to the settlement patterns of immigrants and the agricultural orientation of the state.

The greatest number of elementary principals surveyed were those whose undergraduate majors were in elementary education. Principals with an elementary major at the undergraduate level were more likely to be female. Those with secondary education as their undergraduate major were more likely to be male. A partial reason may have been that until recent years the male teacher in the elementary school was comparatively rare. It was also typical that men with secondary backgrounds were often incorporated into the elementary positions that needed to be filled because male secondary teachers were sometimes held in higher esteem as potential leaders than females with elementary backgrounds. Male educators were often sought out to fill the position as principal because they were apparently perceived by many as more capable of handling discipline, maintaining authority, and using other skills necessary to carry on the leadership functions. The male principal may have been able to better perceive the opportunity for a leadership role and thus had greater aspirations for the administrative position.

The highest degree held by most principals in North Dakota was the master's degree. Of the principals holding the master's degree or higher, the majority were more likely to be male. Of those principals holding a bachelor's degree or less, the principals were more likely to be female. Those with master's degrees or higher were more likely to be employed in urban communities and larger schools.

The credential held by most principals was the Level I credential. Principals holding Level I and Level II credentials were more likely to be male. Those with Level III credentials were more likely to be female. The principals with the Level I credentials were more likely to be found in urban communities and larger schools. Principals holding Level II and Level III credentials were more likely to be found in rural communities and

middle- and small-size schools. The reasons for the degree and credential distribution were most likely caused by education and employment patterns, family responsibilities, and attitudes of the educator and the hiring personnel.

Leadership training was found to be almost evenly divided between those who had and those who had not received it in their preparatory programs. Those who had were slightly more numerous and were more likely to be male. This may have been due to the fact that leadership training typically takes place at the graduate level. Therefore, the higher the credential and degree, the greater the probability of having received leadership training.

The place of work when receiving the appointment to the principalship was most frequently found to be from within the district. This principal was most likely to be female. Principals from outside the district or from other fields were more likely to be male. Employment from within the district may have reflected the fact that many principals in rural districts were full-time teachers. Employment from outside the district may have resulted from the greater mobility of male principals.

The majority of the principals reported they had been principal in their present school less than five years. The principal who had been in the present position less than five years was more likely to be female in a smaller school. If they had been principal for more than five years they were more likely to be male. This fact may have been due to the trend toward an increasing number of male principals since World War II in order to provide jobs for veterans. This trend continued to the present time resulting in an ever-decreasing number of female principals. An increase in employment of female principals has taken place only in the last two or three years previous to this study.

Principals who had experience as principals in another school previous to their present position were more likely to be male. These principals were more likely to be in urban communities and larger schools. Larger schools apparently place more emphasis on experience as a qualification for employment. Seemingly, there had not been a sufficient number of females preparing for the principalship with enough years of educational training to meet this qualification for employment.

Eleven of the principals had been superintendents. Of these, one was female. The reasons for so few female superintendents would likely be attributable to factors such as education, experience, and attitude.

Of the 118 principals who were elementary classroom teachers, the larger number were female. Of principals who had been classroom teachers less than five years, the greater number were males employed in larger schools. The principals who were elementary classroom teachers more than five years were more likely to be female.

Of the 41 principals who had been secondary classroom teachers, the greater number had been secondary teachers for less than five years. These teachers were more likely to be male. The reported frequencies of professional experience are shown in table 3.

A significant relationship existed between the percentage of time spent carrying out principalship duties and the sex of the principal, type of community, and size of the school. The largest number were full-time principals. Of those who were not full-time principals, the largest percentage reported spending less than 20% of their time carrying out principalship duties. The full-time principals were more likely to be male, in urban communities, and in smaller schools. The part-time principals were more likely to be female, in rural communities, and in smaller schools. As previously discussed, these factors may be attributable to education,

TABLE 3

REPORTED FREQUENCIES OF YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Years	Years Principal in This School	Years Principal in Another School	Years Superintendent	Years Elementary Teacher	Years Secondary Teacher	Years Other
0	4 2.7	104 69.3	139 92.7	32 21.3	109 72.7	119 79.3
1-5	86 57.3	35 23.3	5 3.3	38 25.3	25 16.7	25 16.7
6-10	29 19.3	8 5.3	1 0.7	28 18.7	10 6.7	6 4.0
11-15	16 10.6	1 0.7	2 1.3	18 12.0	3 2.0	0 0.0
16-20	6 4.0	2 1.3	0 0.0	21 14.0	3 2.0	0 0.0
21-25	4 2.7	0 0.0	2 1.3	6 4.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
26-30	3 2.0	0 0.0	1 0.7	4 2.7	0 0.0	0 0.0
31-35	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 0.7	0 0.0	0 0.0
36-40	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 1.3	0 0.0	0 0.0
TOTAL	150 100.0	46 30.7	11 7.3	118 78.7	41 27.3	3 20.7

experience, and attitude.

Of the principals who were not full-time, the greater number reported classroom teaching as their additional duty. These principals were more likely to be female in a rural community. Those who reported doing other administrative duties were more likely to be male.

Most principals felt they had a great deal of influence about the decision making in their own buildings, but only a moderate amount at the district level. The amount of influence probably varied with personalities, personal relationships, and policies of the school district regarding the role of the principal.

Most principals were members of the North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals. Most principals were not members of the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the North Dakota Council of School Administrators. Principals may have felt the financial impact of inflation and, therefore, felt they could not afford multiple memberships. Those principals who spent less than 20% of their time in carrying out the duties of the principalship may not have felt the cost of membership warranted. Principals in the latter category were probably more interested in membership in teachers' organizations.

Should data concerning the elementary principal of North Dakota be of interest copies of the study, "Prototypic Description of the Elementary Principal of North Dakota," are available from University of North Dakota Center for Teaching and Learning Independent Study Library; University of North Dakota Phi Delta Kappa's George Reavis Reading Room; North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals; North Dakota Council of School Administrators; University of North Dakota Bureau of Educational Research and Services; North Dakota Department of Public Instruction; and Isabel Hovel, Box 631, Walhalla, North Dakota 58282.

CHAPTER III

THE SCHOOL AND SCHOOL SETTING IN WHICH NORTH DAKOTA PRINCIPALS WORK

Many influences have acted upon elementary schools in North Dakota to force changes. Rising costs, staff cuts, declining enrollments, inflation, and high energy costs have precipitated the process of change in the schools. Other influences creating change have been the demands for higher educational standards from such groups as the "back to basics", the "moral majority", and the trend from federal responsibility for programs to local control and responsibility.

The school board's decisions for change, such as budget cuts and program or policy changes, have been left to the principals for implementation. The numerous state and federal programs requiring extensive paperwork have also been the responsibility of the principals and have often forced principals from a role of instructional leadership to a role of management. As principals have attempted to meet the needs of students and faculty and the demands of the school board and community, their roles and functions have become exceedingly complex.

The purposes of this study were to describe the elementary schools of North Dakota, their organizational patterns, students, staff, community, facilities, educational programs, problem conflicts, and the changes that are occurring within the school. This study was also intended to describe the tasks, authority, and job satisfaction of elementary principals.

A survey instrument of 51 items was mailed to 150 principals in North Dakota, of which 75 were male principals and 75 were female principals. That survey instrument is presented here with the principals' responses showing both absolute and relative frequencies.

The North Dakota Elementary School Principalship
Study: School and Setting

DIRECTIONS: Please answer every question! Be sure to check both sides of the paper. Some questions require one response and some require more than one. Those requiring (or allowing) more than one response will be designated. In all cases, please choose the "best" answer--the one that most clearly or appropriately fits your situation. Thank you.

School Organization

1. How many elementary students were enrolled in your school on September 1, 1981 for the 1981-1982 academic year?
   0-50 37 (24.7%) 51-100 22 (14.7%) 101-150 15 (10.0%)
   151-200 19 (12.7%) 201-300 21 (14.0%) 301 or more 36 (24.0%)

2. What grades are included in your school?
   K-4 2 (1.3%) K-6 82 (54.7%) K-8 25 (16.7%) 1-4 1 (0.7%)
   1-6 19 (12.7%) 1-8 20 (13.3%) 5-8 1 (0.7%)

3. What percentage of your teachers are using open-space, flexible classrooms in the 1981-1982 school year?
   0% 107 (71.3%) 1-4% 12 (8.0%) 5-9% 2 (1.3%) 10-25% 5 (3.3%)
   25% or more 22 (14.7%)

4. What percentage of the classrooms in your school are currently self-contained?
   0-10% 14 (9.3%) 11-50% 11 (7.3%) 51-75% 14 (9.3%)
   75-100% 111 (74.0%)

5. What percentage of the students in your elementary school are team taught?
   0% 110 (73.3%) 1-4% 8 (5.3%) 5-9% 7 (4.7%)
   10-25% 12 (8.0%) 26-50% 7 (4.7%) 50-100% 4 (2.7%)

6. What percentage of the classes in your elementary school are departmentalized?
   0% 83 (55.3%) 1-4% 12 (8.0%) 5-9% 6 (4.0%)
   10-25% 26 (17.3%) 26-50% 14 (9.3%) 50-100% 8 (5.3%)

7. What type of facilities do your students and/or staff have access to regularly? (Check as many as apply.)

lounge for teachers	122 (81.3%)	student cafeteria	120 (80.0%)
teacher resource center	67 (44.7%)	gymnasium	129 (86.0%)
central library	121 (80.7%)	playground	145 (96.7%)
remedial reading or math lab	96 (64.0%)		
alternative school or alternative school program	15 (10.0%)		

8. From which Federal or State programs does your school receive funds? (Check as many as apply.)

Federal Title I (ESEA)	123 (82.0%)	State compensatory education	25 (16.7%)
Special education	108 (72.0%)	Bilingual education	5 (3.3%)
Library programs	86 (57.3%)	Title IV-innovative programs	81 (54.0%)
Free or reduced lunch program	132 (88.0%)	Student transportation	95 (63.3%)
ESAA (desegregation)	2 (1.3%)	Other 21 (14.0%) Specify_____	

9. Do you have a community advisory group(s) with whom you meet regularly concerning school policy and planning?
yes 71 (47.3%) no 79 (52.7%)

10. Do you have a staff advisory group with whom you meet regularly concerning school policy and planning?
yes 65 (43.3%) no 82 (54.7%)

11. If you have a staff advisory group, who participates? (Check as many as apply.)

Assistant Principals ...	21 (14.0%)	Guidance Counselors	15 (10.0%)
Department or Team Heads	16 (10.7%)	Teachers	64 (42.7%)
Parents	22 (14.7%)	Others 12 (8.0%)	Specify_____
Students	8 (5.3%)	NA 27 (18.0%)	

12. Which of the following programs are taught by specialists in your elementary school? (Check as many as apply.)

Gifted Program	33 (22.0%)	Speech Therapy	132 (88.0%)
Multiple Handicapped Program	39 (26.0%)	Remedial Math	59 (39.3%)
Remedial Reading	116 (77.3%)	Band Instruction	114 (76.0%)
Art	27 (18.0%)	Physical Education ..	114 (76.0%)
Music/Chorus	124 (82.7%)	Program for Emotionally Disturbed	23 (15.3%)
Foreign Language	6 (4.0%)		
Ethnic Studies	4 (2.7%)	Sex Education	12 (8.0%)
Values Clarification	15 (10.0%)	Consumer Education ..	6 (4.0%)
Learning Disabilities Program	125 (83.3%)		

13. Are the students in grades K, 1, and 2 grouped by ability for the entire grade level in one or more academic subjects?
yes 76 (50.7%) no 62 (41.3%) NA 12 (8.0%)

14. Are the students in grades 3 and 4 grouped by ability for the entire grade level in one or more academic subjects?
yes 78 (52.0%) no 60 (40.0%) NA 12 (8.0%)

15. Are the students in grades 5 and 6 grouped by ability for the entire grade level in one or more academic subjects?
yes 65 (43.3%) no 71 (47.3%) NA 14 (9.3%)

16. Are the students in grades 7 and 8 grouped by ability for the entire grade level in one or more academic subjects?
yes 29 (19.3%) no 44 (29.3%) NA 75 (50.0%)

17. What grading system(s) does your school use for students? (Check as many as apply.)

A-B-C-D-F	128 (85.3%)	Written narrative evaluations	49 (32.7%)
Numerical	17 (11.3%)	Conferences	117 (78.0%)
Percentages	30 (20.0%)	Continuous progress	7 (4.7%)
Pass-Fail	19 (12.7%)	Self-evaluation	2 (1.3%)
Satisfactory, Needs Improvement	109 (72.7%)	No grade reports	5 (3.3%)
Checklist of objectives	43 (28.7%)	Other 3 (2.0%) Specify_____	

18. In your opinion, how important are the following educational goals to parents in your school? (Check one for each goal.)

Goals	Very	Moderately	Marginally	Unimportant
Teaching the basic skills	134 (89.3%)	14 (9.3%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)
Developing high moral standards and citizenship	89 (59.3%)	56 (37.3%)	4 (2.7%)	1 (0.7%)
Teaching students to get along with others	84 (56.0%)	57 (38.0%)	8 (5.3%)	1 (0.7%)
Developing student responsibility for their own learning program	56 (37.3%)	69 (46.0%)	23 (15.3%)	2 (1.3%)
Developing aesthetic appreciation	30 (20.0%)	69 (46.0%)	45 (30.0%)	6 (4.0%)

19. Does your school operate on a 12 month school year?
yes 3 (2.0%) no 142 (94.7%)

If yes, is the summer program:
a voluntary, remedial/enrichment program 6 (4.0%)
a continuation of the entire regular academic program .. 0 (0.0%)

School Management and Decision Making

20. How many standing committees, ad hoc committees, and task forces does your school have?

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 or more
Standing Committees	75 (50.0%)	22 (14.7%)	22 (14.7%)	9 (6.0%)	8 (5.3%)	3 (2.0%)	2 (1.3%)	3 (2.0%)	6 (4.0%)
Ad Hoc Committees	116 (77.3%)	12 (8.0%)	12 (8.0%)	6 (4.0%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Task Forces	119 (79.3%)	18 (12.0%)	9 (6.0%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

21. How frequently do you meet with the following district-level people to discuss school management or programs of instruction? (Check one item in each row.)

	At least Once a Week	2 or 3 Times a Week	Once a Month	Once a Year	Several Times a Year	Not at All	Not Applicable
Superintendent	44 (29.3%)	29 (19.3%)	30 (20.0%)	1 (0.7%)	24 (16.0%)	3 (2.0%)	13 (8.7%)
Central office budget specialists	8 (5.3%)	5 (3.3%)	15 (10.0%)	9 (6.0%)	23 (15.3%)	14 (9.3%)	69 (46.0%)
Central office curriculum specialists	7 (4.7%)	2 (1.3%)	13 (8.7%)	6 (4.0%)	17 (11.3%)	14 (9.3%)	82 (54.7%)
Area or regional administrators	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.7%)	11 (7.3%)	26 (17.3%)	34 (22.7%)	17 (11.3%)	50 (33.3%)
Principals of other schools	16 (10.7%)	4 (2.7%)	22 (14.7%)	17 (11.3%)	38 (25.3%)	21 (14.0%)	26 (17.3%)
Board/advisory groups	4 (2.7%)	2 (1.3%)	69 (46.0%)	8 (5.3%)	30 (20.0%)	11 (7.3%)	24 (16.0%)

22. How frequently are the following school-level meetings held? (Check one item in each row.)

	0	1/week	2-3/month	1/month	Several a Year	1/year	Not Applicabl
Regular faculty meetings	1 (0.7%)	29 (19.3%)	38 (25.3%)	47 (31.3%)	21 (14.0%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (6.7%)
Team/grade level meetings	13 (8.7%)	13 (8.7%)	12 (8.0%)	11 (7.3%)	29 (19.3%)	5 (3.3%)	63 (42.0%)
Administrative staff meetings	9 (6.0%)	26 (17.3%)	23 (15.3%)	32 (21.3%)	22 (14.7%)	0 (0.0%)	33 (22.0%)
Policy or planning group meetings	6 (4.0%)	7 (4.7%)	4 (2.7%)	32 (21.3%)	53 (35.3%)	14 (9.3%)	28 (18.7%)
PTA-type meetings	19 (12.7%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.0%)	33 (22.0%)	45 (30.0%)	5 (3.3%)	41 (27.3%)
Parent advisory group meetings	14 (9.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.0%)	16 (10.7%)	66 (44.0%)	10 (6.7%)	35 (23.3%)
Student council meetings	22 (14.7%)	2 (1.3%)	7 (4.7%)	7 (4.7%)	6 (4.0%)	0 (0.0%)	98 (65.3%)

23. How often do your teachers receive a formal evaluation after their probationary period?

More than once a year	55 (36.7%)	Every 2-3 years	5 (3.3%)
Once a year	58 (38.7%)	Rarely or not at all	30 (20.0%)

24. Who participates in the formal evaluation of your teachers? (Check as many as apply.)

Principal	118 (78.7%)	Teachers: self-evaluation	40 (26.7%)
Assistant Principal ...	3 (2.0%)	Students	5 (3.3%)
Grade level or team head	0 (0.0%)	Parents	2 (1.3%)
Teachers: peer evaluations	4 (2.7%)	Others 37 (24.7%)	Specify_____

25. From October through April of the school year, about how often do you observe in classrooms?

Daily	11 (7.3%)	2-3 times a month ...	28 (18.7%)
Several times a week	28 (18.7%)	Several times a year	44 (29.3%)
Once a week	11 (7.3%)	Not at all	23 (15.3%)

26. How often do you receive a formal evaluation?

More than once a year	20 (13.3%)	Every 2-3 years	11 (7.3%)
Once a year	54 (36.0%)	Rarely or not at all	60 (40.0%)

27. Who participates in the formal evaluation of your performance as principal? (Check as many as apply.)

School Board	48 (32.0%)	Teachers	31 (20.7%)
Superintendent	103 (68.7%)	School support staff (clerical, maintenance)	4 (2.7%)
Central office or area administrators	6 (4.0%)	Students	1 (0.7%)
Principal: self-evaluation	27 (18.0%)	Parents	6 (4.0%)
Assistant Administrators	9 (6.0%)	Others	7 (4.7%)

Rules

28. What regulations; state, district, or local school, govern your activity in the following areas? (Check as many as apply.)

	State	District	School
Adding a new academic program	55 (36.7%)	93 (62.0%)	79 (52.7%)
Setting rules for student behavior	11 (7.3%)	45 (30.0%)	130 (86.7%)
Adopting a new school grading system	4 (2.7%)	71 (47.3%)	109 (72.7%)
Determining course objectives	32 (21.3%)	55 (36.7%)	113 (75.3%)
Setting criteria for teacher evaluation	13 (8.7%)	89 (59.3%)	88 (58.7%)
Allocating school budget funds among grades, teachers, and/or activities	22 (14.7%)	94 (62.7%)	84 (56.0%)

29. Which of the following rules exist in your school, and how strictly are they enforced? (Check one per row.)

A. Rule Existence

Student Behavior	Formal	Informal	None
No swearing	92 (61.3%)	57 (38.0%)	25 (16.7%)
Students responsible for property damage	109 (72.7%)	39 (26.0%)	2 (1.3%)
No smoking rules	104 (69.3%)	28 (18.7%)	18 (12.0%)
Rules about student dress	28 (18.7%)	73 (48.7%)	49 (32.7%)

Teacher Behavior	Formal	Informal	None
Bringing outside speaker into class	32 (21.3%)	94 (62.7%)	23 (15.3%)
Leaving classroom unsupervised	105 (70.0%)	36 (24.0%)	7 (4.7%)
Controlling disruptive students	106 (70.7%)	41 (27.3%)	2 (1.3%)
Dealing with parent complaints	86 (57.3%)	62 (41.3%)	2 (1.3%)
Amount of homework given students	42 (28.0%)	89 (59.3%)	18 (12.3%)
Field trips	75 (50.0%)	67 (44.7%)	6 (4.0%)

B. Rule Enforcement

Student Behavior	Strict	Moderate	Weak	NA
No swearing	103 (68.7%)	41 (27.3%)	2 (1.3%)	3 (2.0%)
Students responsible for property damage	111 (74.0%)	33 (22.0%)	2 (1.3%)	4 (2.7%)
No smoking rules	109 (72.7%)	14 (9.3%)	1 (0.7%)	25 (16.7%)
Rules about student dress	21 (14.0%)	64 (42.7%)	24 (16.0%)	41 (27.3%)
Teacher Behavior				
Bringing outside speaker into class	18 (12.0%)	90 (60.0%)	17 (11.3%)	24 (16.0%)
Leaving classroom unsupervised	93 (62.0%)	45 (30.0%)	6 (4.0%)	5 (3.3%)
Controlling disruptive students	101 (67.3%)	42 (28.0%)	4 (2.7%)	3 (2.0%)
Dealing with parent complaints	71 (47.3%)	69 (46.0%)	6 (4.0%)	4 (2.7%)
Amount of homework given students	30 (20.0%)	90 (60.0%)	13 (8.7%)	17 (11.3%)
Field trips	52 (34.7%)	70 (46.7%)	12 (8.0%)	10 (6.7%)

30. Do you administer discretionary or contingency funds over which you have control?

yes 59 (39.3%) no 90 (60.0%)

If yes, what is the total of the fund(s)?

under $100 12 (8.0%) more than $1,000 ..... 21 (14.0%)
$100-500 21 (14.0%) Other 1 (0.7%) Specify_____
$500-1,000 8 (5.3%) _____

31. Do your teachers have discretionary or contingency funds which they can spend?

yes 42 (28.0%) no 108 (72.0%)

If yes, what is the total of this fund(s) per teacher?

under $100 27 (18.0%) more than $1,000 ..... 0 (0.0%)
$100-500 12 (8.0%) Other 4 (2.7%) Specify_____
$500-1,000 0 (0.0%) _____

Involvement in Decision Making

32. How much authority do you have to make the choice between hiring one full-time teacher or hiring two teacher aides?

Complete 9 (6.0%) Considerable 76 (50.7%) Little 32 (21.3%)
None ... 32 (21.3%)

33. How much influence do you have in making decisions concerning the district's budget allocations to your school?

Extensive 6 (4.0%) Considerable 44 (29.3%) Little 53 (35.3%)
None 47 (31.3%)

34. How much authority do you have to fill teacher vacancies?

Principal chooses; central office usually endorses 52 (34.7%)
Principal chooses within central office limits ... 27 (18.0%)
Central office chooses 28 (18.7%)
Other 40 (26.7%) Specify_____

Problems

35. In your opinion, to what degree is each of these matters a problem in your school? (Check one per row.)

	Very Serious	Serious	Minor	Not at All
School too small to offer a wide range of programs	11 (7.3%)	33 (22.0%)	68 (45.3%)	36 (24.0%)
School too large to give students enough personal attention	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.0%)	23 (15.3%)	122 (81.3%)

	Very Serious	Serious	Minor	Not at All
Inadequate instructional materials	1 (0.7%)	4 (2.7%)	75 (50.0%)	70 (46.7%)
Not enough guidance counselors	15 (10.0%)	45 (30.0%)	67 (44.7%)	23 (15.3%)
Teacher absenteeism	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	55 (36.7%)	92 (61.3%)
Teacher union specifications	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.3%)	49 (32.7%)	94 (62.7%)
Teachers' lack of commitment	3 (2.0%)	4 (2.7%)	71 (47.3%)	70 (46.7%)
Teacher incompetence	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.3%)	64 (42.7%)	81 (54.0%)
Teacher turnover	2 (1.3%)	3 (2.0%)	80 (53.3%)	65 (43.3%)
Student absenteeism (entire day)	0 (0.0%)	9 (6.0%)	102 (68.0%)	39 (26.0%)
Student apathy	1 (0.7%)	15 (10.0%)	108 (72.0%)	24 (16.0%)
Student disruptiveness	2 (1.3%)	6 (4.0%)	120 (80.0%)	22 (14.7%)
Parents' lack of interest in students' progress	4 (2.7%)	13 (8.7%)	107 (71.3%)	25 (16.7%)
Parents' lack of involvement in school matters	3 (2.0%)	24 (16.0%)	96 (64.0%)	25 (16.7%)
District office interference with principals leadership	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	52 (34.7%)	96 (64.0%)
State-imposed curriculum restrictions	2 (1.3%)	6 (4.0%)	68 (45.3%)	74 (49.3%)
Implementing Federal or State requirements for equal opportunity	1 (0.7%)	9 (6.0%)	54 (36.0%)	84 (56.0%)
Too much required paperwork	6 (4.0%)	18 (12.0%)	89 (59.3%)	37 (24.7%)
Other	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.0%)	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.0%)

Specify_____

36. Generally speaking, how often would you say conflict occurs within your school? (Check one per row.)

	Daily	Once a Week	Once a Month	Rarely or Never
Among students	49 (32.7%)	34 (22.7%)	34 (22.7%)	29 (19.3%)
Among teachers	1 (0.7%)	9 (6.0%)	24 (16.0%)	114 (76.0%)
Between teachers and students	14 (9.3%)	34 (22.7%)	45 (30.0%)	54 (36.0%)
Between teachers and principal	2 (1.3%)	3 (2.0%)	22 (14.7%)	121 (80.7%)
Between students and principal	8 (5.3%)	18 (12.0%)	42 (28.0%)	80 (53.3%)
Between teachers and parents	2 (1.3%)	3 (2.0%)	43 (28.7%)	101 (67.3%)
Between school administrators and parents	2 (1.3%)	6 (4.0%)	35 (23.3%)	106 (70.7%)
Between school and central office	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	13 (8.7%)	130 (86.7%)

37. In the past 5 years, how have things changed in your school? (Check one per row.)

	Increased	Stayed about the Same	Decreased
Extent of joing planning among teachers	78 (52.0%)	65 (43.3%)	2 (1.3%)
Number of persons involved in school decision making	53 (35.3%)	92 (61.3%)	3 (2.0%)
Number of staff in general	49 (32.7%)	72 (48.0%)	26 (17.3%)
Number of specialists (L.D., speech, resource teachers, etc.)	82 (54.7%)	59 (39.3%)	5 (3.3%)
Emphasis on basic reading, math, and writing skills	83 (55.3%)	65 (43.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Your school enrollment	45 (30.0%)	44 (29.3%)	59 (39.3%)

	Increased	Stayed about the Same	Decreased
Student academic achievement (standardized test scores)	54 (36.0%)	90 (60.0%)	4 (2.7%)
Your schools per-pupil budget	101 (67.3%)	32 (21.3%)	14 (9.3%)
Average class size	30 (20.0%)	58 (38.7%)	60 (40.0%)
Number of student activities	43 (28.7%)	99 (66.0%)	6 (4.0%)
Use of school facilities for community-related activities	59 (39.3%)	83 (55.3%)	5 (3.3%)

Students and Community

38. In 1981-1982, what percentage of your current total student body belonged to the following groups? (Check one per row.)

	None	1-4%	5-19%	20-50%	51-100%
White	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.3%)	143 (95.3%)
American Indian/Alaskan native	59 (39.3%)	65 (43.3%)	14 (9.3%)	5 (3.3%)	7 (4.7%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	111 (74.0%)	35 (23.3%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Black	118 (78.7%)	31 (20.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Hispanic	119 (79.3%)	29 (19.3%)	2 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Other	146 (97.3%)	3 (2.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Specify_____

39. During 1981-1982, approximately what percentage of your students were bused?
None 14 (9.3%) 1-19% 25 (16.7%) 20-50% 44 (29.3%)
51% or more 67 (44.7%)

40. About what percentage of your elementary students (1-6) are taking remedial work in reading?
None 9 (6.0%) 1-4% 35 (23.3%) 5-9% 42 (28.0%)
10-14% 45 (30.0%) 15-100% 19 (12.7%)

41. About what percentage of your elementary students (1-6) are taking remedial work in math?

None	40 (26.7%)	1-4%	53 (35.3%)	5-9%	25 (16.7%)
10-14%	23 (15.3%)	15-100%	9 (6.0%)		

42. What phrase best describes the occupations of your students' parents?

Almost all white-collar/professional	3 (2.0%)
Mostly white-collar; some blue-collar	9 (6.0%)
Evenly mixed	24 (16.0%)
Mostly blue-collar; some white collar	80 (53.3%)
Almost all blue-collar/laborer	30 (20.0%)
Mostly unemployed or on welfare	3 (2.0%)

43. What phrase best describes the housing in which your students' parents live?

Almost all owner-occupied homes	54 (36.0%)
Mostly owner-occupied, some rental apartments	69 (46.0%)
Evenly mixed	17 (11.3%)
Mostly rental units, some owner-occupied homes	8 (5.3%)
Almost all rental units	1 (0.7%)

44. How would the area served by your school be described?

Urban: Industrial, commercial (25,000-50,000 in population)	1 (0.7%)
Urban: Residential (25,000-50,000 in population)	19 (12.7%)
Suburban: Outskirts of city of 25,000+	5 (3.3%)
Medium city (10,000-24,000 in population)	14 (9.3%)
Small city (2,000-9,000 in population)	20 (13.3%)
Small town (population of less than 2,000)	69 (46.0%)
Rural (no town or town with only one business place)	19 (12.7%)

45. What is your school district's current average per elementary pupil expenditure (excepting for capital outlay and debt service)? (Use information from form SF01 revised.)

Less than $1,500	44 (29.3%)	$2,000-2,249	23 (15.3%)
$1,500-1,749	33 (22.0%)	$2,250-2,500	6 (4.0%)
$1,750-1,999	23 (15.3%)	$2,500 or more	10 (6.7%)

Staff

46. How many of the following persons are on your elementary school's professional staff? (Check as many as apply.)

Assistant principals and deans	19 (12.7%)
Guidance counselors	51 (34.0%)
Classroom teachers	146 (97.3%)
Librarians	95 (63.3%)
Teacher aides	110 (73.3%)
Specialists (e.g., special education, resource teachers, psychologists)	121 (80.7%)
Volunteers	48 (32.0%)
Student Teachers	48 (32.0%)

47. What percentage of the elementary school's professional staff belongs to the following groups? (Check one per row.)

	None	1-4%	5-19%	20-50%	51-100%
White	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.0%)	143 (95.3%)
American Indian/Alaskan native	133 (88.7%)	10 (6.7%)	3 (2.0%)	3 (2.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	149 (99.3%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Black	149 (99.3%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Hispanic	148 (98.7%)	2 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Other	150 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Specify_____

48. What is the sexual make-up of your professional staff? Percentage of women equals:
0-33% 1 (0.7%) 34-49% 4 (2.7%) 50-66% 16 (10.7%)
67-100% 129 (86.0%)

49. How many days of inservice education for teachers were scheduled by your school or district between June 1981 and June 1982?
None 13 (8.7%) 1-2 64 (42.7%) 3-4 40 (26.7%) 5-6 17 (11.3%)
7 or more 16 (10.7%)

50. Including yourself, how many principals or acting principals has your school had in the last 10 years?
1 45 (30.0%) 2 47 (31.3%) 3 31 (20.7%) 4 or more 26 (17.3%)

51. In general, how satisfied are you with the following? (Check one per row.)

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Occupation as principal	80 (53.3%)	54 (36.0%)	12 (8.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Faculty of your school	109 (72.7%)	30 (20.0%)	7 (4.7%)	1 (0.7%)
Students' achievement	59 (39.3%)	81 (54.0%)	8 (5.3%)	2 (1.3%)
Relationship with district office	88 (58.7%)	45 (30.0%)	2 (1.3%)	3 (2.0%)

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Relationship with parents and community	98 (65.3%)	47 (31.3%)	4 (2.7%)	1 (0.7%)
Performance of your school board	74 (49.3%)	59 (39.3%)	13 (8.7%)	2 (1.3%)

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Add your comments:

According to the data, the enrollments of North Dakota elementary schools were small. Three-fourths of the schools had enrollments of less than 300. The enrollments in nearly one-fourth of the schools were less than 50, which is no doubt a reflection of the rural farming communities of North Dakota.

The schools operated on a nine-month basis with the exception of three schools. Those three schools offered summer enrichment programs.

The cost per pupil in the schools varied. About one-third of the schools spent less than $1,500 per pupil, while one-fourth of the schools spent more than $2,000 per pupil.

The predominant organizational patterns for the schools were grades K-6, K-8, 1-6, and 1-8. More than one-half of the schools were organized into grades K-6. This trend may continue as the state takes more full financial responsibility for kindergarten.

The classrooms in the schools were most likely to be self-contained. The departmentalization that occurred in about 45% of the schools and the team teaching that occurred in nearly one-fourth of the schools were usually limited to a small percentage of the classrooms.

Ability grouping was utilized in about one-half of the schools in grades K-6. The ability grouping diminished to only about one-fifth of

the schools for grades 7 and 8.

The elementary schools were more likely to be situated in small towns with a population of less than 2,000. Other locations of the schools were rural, small city, and urban residential, with about 13% of the schools located in each.

The schools were more likely to have a teacher's lounge, central library, student cafeteria, gymnasium, playground, and a remedial math/reading lab. The majority of the schools received state and federal funding that provided programs for Title I, special education, free/reduced lunch, and student transportation. About one-half of the schools received funds for Title IV innovative programs.

Other services offered in over three-fourths of the schools were remedial reading, music/chorus, learning disabilities, speech therapy, band, and physical education, all of which were taught by specialists. Most of the schools had from 1% to 15% of the students in remedial math and reading.

The occupations of the parents as described by the principals were mostly from the three following groups: blue-collar with some white-collar, almost all blue-collar/laborer, or evenly mixed. In slightly more than one-half of the schools the predominant occupation was mostly blue-collar with some white-collar.

The housing in 46% of the school communities was owner-occupied, with some rental apartments. In the other school communities the housing was all owner-occupied (36%) or evenly mixed (11.3%).

The professional staff members of the schools were predominantly women. The staffs were two-thirds or more women in 86% of the schools. The professional staff was most likely to consist of classroom teachers, a librarian, teacher aides, and specialists. About one-third of the schools

had a guidance counselor, student teachers, or volunteers as part of the staff. The staff of the elementary schools was predominantly white, but nearly 10% had some staff members of American Indian heritage.

Based on the data gathered in the study, the student body of the schools could be described as predominantly white (95.3%). Seven (4.7%) of the schools were from 50% to 100% American Indian or Alaskan native. These were schools located on or near the four Indian reservations in North Dakota.

Certain goals were reported by the principals as being important to the parents. Principals believed the most important goal to parents was the teaching of basic skills. Other goals believed to be important to parents in over one-half of the schools were developing high standards and teaching students to get along.

In reporting student progress to parents, the most commonly used grading systems in nearly three-fourths of the schools were A-B-C-D-F, satisfactory/needs improvement, and parent conferences. Nearly one-third of the schools utilized narrative evaluations in reporting to parents.

A number of problems were considered by the principals to be serious or very serious in their schools. In 40% of the schools not enough guidance counselors was a serious problem, while nearly 30% of the schools were too small to offer a wide range of programs. Other problems that were serious were parents' lack of involvement in school matters in 18% of the schools and too much required paperwork in 16% of the schools. Most of the listed problems which occur in the schools, however, were considered minor or rare.

The conflicts that occurred in the schools usually involved students. In over 80% of the schools, conflict among students occurred daily, once a week, or monthly. Nearly two-thirds of the principals (64%) reported

conflicts between students and teachers, and in about 45% of the schools student/principal conflicts occurred. Conflicts among teachers, between teachers and parents, between administrators and parents, or between the school and central office were rare.

The principals reported changes that occurred in the past five years and in over one-half of the schools there was an increase in the extent of joint teacher planning, the number of specialists, emphasis on basic skills, and the per pupil budget. About one-third of the principals reported increases in persons involved in decision making, number of staff, student academic achievement, number of student activities, community use of school facilities, and school enrollment. However, student enrollment dropped in 39.3% of the schools. The average class size increased in one-fifth (20%) of the schools, while class size decreased in 40% of the schools.

The data concerning the tasks and functions of the principal revealed the majority of the principals scheduled one to four days of inservice education and about one-fifth of the principals provided five or more days of inservice. Over three-fourths of the principals formally evaluated the teachers once a year or more and about one-fourth of the principals utilized teacher self-evaluations. Only 56% of the principals themselves were formally evaluated, usually by the superintendent. Nearly 85% of the principals made classroom observations which ranged from daily to several a year.

In conducting the functions of the principalship, the principals met with various groups. Less than one-half of the principals met with staff or community advisory groups and one-half of the schools had one or two standing committees. The majority of the schools had no ad hoc committee or task force. Nine out of ten principals (90%) met with the superintendent

regularly to discuss school management or programs of instruction, and two-thirds of the principals met with their school board/ advisory groups. Only 53.7% of the principals met with other principals regularly. Nine out of ten principals conducted regular faculty meetings and administrative staff meetings were held in two-thirds of the schools. Policy/planning meetings and PTA meetings occurred once a month or several times a year in about one-half of the schools.

The majority of the principals in the study reported that they were not governed by state regulations for most activities. About 60% of the principals were required to follow district regulations when adding a new academic program, setting criteria for teacher evaluations, and allocating school budget funds. The majority of the principals in the study followed local school guidelines in setting rules for student behavior, in adopting a new grading system, and in determining course objectives.

Another of the functions of the principals reported in the study was the establishment and enforcement of rules for student and teacher behaviors. Over 80% of the principals worked in schools which had formal or informal rules for student swearing, responsibility for property damage, and smoking. Over 80% of the principals also worked in schools which had rules for teachers bringing in speakers, for teachers leaving the classroom unsupervised, for controlling disruptive students, for handling parent complaints, for the amount of homework given, and for field trips. The student rules were strictly enforced in the majority of the schools, except for student dress codes which were moderately enforced. The strictly enforced rules about teacher behaviors were leaving the classroom unsupervised and controlling disruptive students.

Only about 40% of the principals reported control of a contingency fund. The amount in the principal's contingency fund was more than $1,000 in 14% of the schools but $500 or less in 22% of the schools.

The teachers had access to a contingency fund in only 28% of the schools. In 18% of the schools the amount was under $100, while in 8% of the schools the amount was between $100 and $500.

The amount of the principal's authority and influence varied among the schools. The data revealed that one-half of the principals had considerable authority in making the choice between hiring one full-time teacher or hiring two teacher aides. Few principals (6.0%) reported complete authority. The majority of the principals had little or no influence on decisions concerning district budget allocations to their schools. In filling teacher vacancies only about one-third of the principals had authority to make the choice, and in 18.7% of the schools the choice was made by the central office. In 26.7% of the schools the decisions for filling teacher vacancies were made in other ways which may have been the superintendent's decision.

Data concerning principal turnover revealed 61.3% of the schools had only one or two principals in the last 10 years. Thirty-eight percent of the schools had a turnover of three, four, or more principals in the last 10 years.

An examination of the data pertaining to the principal's job satisfaction revealed 72.7% of the principals were very satisfied with their faculty and another 20% were somewhat satisfied with the faculty. The relationship with parents was very satisfactory for 65.3% of the principals and somewhat satisfactory for 31.3% of the principals. Over 86% of the principals were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their occupation as principal, with their relationship with the district office,

and with the performance of the school board.

Conclusions

From the previous descriptions of the elementary schools and the principalship, a number of factors and conclusions appeared to be associated with the following questions:

1. What organizational patterns are utilized in North Dakota elementary schools?

The most often used graded pattern was grades K-6 with 54.7% of the schools using the pattern. Grades K-8 was used in 16.7% of the schools. The K-6 pattern may be predominant because kindergarten is now more fully funded by the state and many districts have included grades 7 and 8 in junior high schools. The graded pattern, as opposed to a nongraded pattern, is probably used because it is easy to administer and has been traditional since 1860. The reason that over 90% of the classrooms were self-contained may have been because teachers prefer the autonomy of the self-contained classrooms and are threatened by the idea of others seeing them teach. Extensive use of open-space, flexible classrooms occurred in only 18% of the schools. This is probably due to the fact that most buildings and classrooms were constructed for use with graded, self-contained classrooms and would require considerable expense to adapt them to an open-space facility.

Less than one-fourth of the schools utilized team teaching and about 15% of the schools departmentalized most of their classrooms. The reasons for the limited use of teaming or departmentalizing may have been because teachers and administrators are reluctant to change to a pattern that requires additional planning time and more careful scheduling.

Students were also grouped by ability in grades K-6 in about one-half of the schools. The purpose of ability grouping was probably to enable the teacher to focus instruction on the needs of the students. Only about one-fifth of the schools were grouped by ability in grades 7 and 8. This may have been because the grouping becomes more apparent to the students at those grades and could cause some students to feel inferior.

2. What problems and conflicts are elementary schools facing, and what factors are associated with those problems?

The problems considered serious by the principals were not enough guidance counselors, school too small to offer a wide range of programs, parents' lack of involvement, and too much paperwork. The lack of guidance counselors may have reflected the fact that small schools cannot afford to provide this service; there may have been a shortage of qualified counselors trained for the elementary level; or with declining enrollments and budget cuts, counselor services may have been eliminated.

It is apparent that since one-half of the schools had enrollments of 150 or less, these schools may have been able to fund and offer a wide range of programs because state aid is tied to enrollments. The limited range of programs in small schools may also have been due to the steady increase in teacher salaries or the difficulty small schools have in attracting specialists and teachers to rural areas.

Lack of involvement in school matters by parents may have been due to the fact that in many homes both parents hold jobs and their time and energy are limited; or in the case of one-parent families, the burden of parenting alone is demanding and time-consuming. Other reasons may be that parents feel education should be the sole responsibility of the schools or because of the decline in organized parent groups such as PTA. The problem of too

much paperwork may have been the result of the extensive paperwork requirements of state and federally funded programs.

The conflicts faced in 80% of the schools involved students. This may have been related to the prevalence of, and increase in, violence on TV to which the students are exposed. The teacher/student conflicts in 62% of the schools may have reflected a lack of individualized instruction or an apparent increase in militancy within society.

3. What significant changes have occurred in the past five years and what are their implications?

In 67.3% of the schools the per pupil budget had increased, which most likely reflected the effects of inflation, salary increases, and the rising costs of energy and books. The emphasis on basic skills increased in 55.3% of the schools and may have been the result of the influence of the "back to basics" groups or of parent demands for "better" education. The number of specialists increased in 54.7% of the schools and was probably the result of the mandates of Public Law 94-142 requiring equal education of the handicapped that must be taught by specialists. The extent of joint planning among teachers increased in 52% of the schools and may have been a reflection of increased professionalism in teachers, a trend toward teaming or departmentalizing, or the need for the support of other teachers because of stress.

The decrease in class size in 40% of the schools seems likely to have been a result of declining enrollments. Twenty percent of the schools reported increases in class size which may have reflected the rising enrollments of schools located in the oil development areas of the state or which may have been due to reductions in staff due to money deficits. "Back to basics" groups and improved teaching methods and materials would likely have some bearing on the increase in student achievement scores that

occurred in 36% of the schools.

4. Are students and staff in the elementary schools in North Dakota heterogeneous or homogeneous with respect to race?

Quite clearly, the student body and professional staff in the schools are homogeneous with respect to race. In 95.3% of the schools, both the student body and staff were predominantly white. This may have been due to the fact that North Dakota is predominantly rural with few large urban centers that would offer a wide variety of jobs to attract a heterogeneous population. In seven schools (4.7%) between 50-100% of the students were Indian. These schools are located on or near the four reservations located in North Dakota. Only one principal reported the professional staff to be over 50% Indian, which may have been because of the limited number of qualified Indian educators.

5. How broadly based is decision making in the elementary schools?

The principals in the study met with many groups, both at the district and school level, for the purposes of decision making. At the district level in making managerial and instructional decisions, 85.3% of the principals met with the superintendent, 75.3% met with the board/advisory groups, 64.7% met with other principals, and 49.3% met with regional administrators. The superintendent, as their immediate superior, and the school board may often have had final approval of many decisions.

Decision making was also broadly based at the school level. Nine out of 10 principals held regular faculty meetings which may have dealt with routine decisions concerning schedules, policies, and instruction. The majority of the principals in the study also met with policy/planning groups and parent advisory groups for decision making. About one-half of the principals met with one or two standing committees, but a majority reported no ad hoc committee or task force. This may have been because these groups

are often formed to deal with crucial issues and at the time of the study many schools may not have been confronted with issues requiring those groups.

6. How comprehensive are programs of instruction, and how well do they meet students' needs?

In addition to the regular academic subjects, over three-fourths of the schools in the study provided remedial reading, music/chorus, learning disabilities, speech, band, and physical education, all taught by specialists. Still further, 82% of the schools had Title I programs (tutoring), 72% had state/federal funded special education programs, and 54% provided Title IV innovative programs. Students also had access to a central library in 80% of the schools. Other programs in some of the schools were remedial reading or math lab, gifted programs, and multiple handicapped programs. Nearly one-fifth of the schools had art teachers and 15.3% had programs for the emotionally disturbed. The comprehensive programs provided may well have been the result of the schools' compliance to Public Law 94-142 and other state or federal requirements or funds. It may also have reflected efforts by the school districts to meet accreditation standards.

7. How much authority do elementary principals have and what coordination mechanisms do they use?

A little more than one-half (52.7%) of the principals had authority to make staff selections and these were usually subject to central office limits. This may have reflected the fact that many principals in North Dakota also teach part-time, thus the superintendents are likely responsible for the final decisions about hiring staff. Only one-third of the principals had considerable or extensive influence over district budget allocations to their schools. The reasons for this limited influence may have

been because so many districts are facing budget cuts and the superintendent and the school board are scrutinizing the allocations carefully and making those decisions.

At the building level, principals did have extensive authority. Over 80% used their authority to establish and enforce rules for student and teacher behavior, probably because they were directly responsible for running an efficient, orderly school. Besides rules, other coordination mechanisms used by over 75% of the principals were teacher evaluations, classroom observations, faculty meetings, and inservice education. The principals most likely used their authority for these activities because it was their direct responsibility or it was a district policy.

8. What factors predict principals' job satisfaction?

The majority of the principals in the study said they were very satisfied with their faculty and with the relationship with parents and community. The faculty may have been a major source of job satisfaction to principals because the performance of the faculty was the direct responsibility of the principal. Being satisfied with the faculty may have been directly related to the extent of the principals' authority in filling teacher vacancies. The principals in this study usually worked with the central office in hiring, and 58.7% of the principals were very satisfied with their relationship with the district office. For 53.3% of the principals, the occupation of principal was very satisfactory, which may be because they considered the principalship as their ultimate career goal. Thirty percent of the principals have been in their jobs for the past 10 years. Principals were the major source of information concerning students, so a satisfactory relationship with parents may have been an indication that a principal was successful. Nearly one-half of the principals considered the performance of the school board as very satisfactory. School boards

may be a factor in job satisfaction because school boards make many of the decisions that directly affect the work and responsibilities of principals, since principals frequently are expected to implement board decisions.

Student achievement was considered very satisfactory by 39.3% of the principals and somewhat satisfactory by 54%. Student achievement was most likely a factor in principal job satisfaction because parents and the public consider high student achievement a sign of a successful school and, therefore, a successful principal.

Should data concerning the elementary principal of North Dakota be of interest copies of the study, "A Descriptive Study of the North Dakota Principalship," are available from University of North Dakota Center for Teaching and Learning Independent Study Library; University of North Dakota Phi Delta Kappa's George Reavis Reading Room; North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals; North Dakota Council of School Administrators; University of North Dakota Bureau of Educational Research and Services; North Dakota Department of Public Instruction; and Jeanette Lindquist, Valley Elementary School, East Grand Forks, Minnesota 56721.

CHAPTER IV

LEADERSHIP AMONG ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS IN NORTH DAKOTA

Education is viewed by the American public as one of the most important factors in the future success of the nation's youth (Gallup 1980). This same public believes the school is a powerful force in the elimination of social injustices, the improvement of society, and the transmitter of cultural values (Knezevich 1975). It is also significant to note that all segments of American society appear to recognize the potential good that can be accomplished through the educational system.

One of the most crucial factors in accomplishing these goals and simultaneously making schools effective is strong leadership. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) defined leadership as "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation" (p. 84). The elementary school principal interacts with a number of individuals and groups with diverse interests in the schools. Students, parents, teachers, school boards, and superintendents have vested interests in what goes on in the elementary school and how the elementary school's leader is performing his or her tasks. Each situation demanding leadership from the elementary principal is also a unique and complex one. Effective school leadership results when the principal becomes aware of his or her own leadership style--the consistent pattern of behaviors used by a leader when he or she is working with and through others toward goal

achievement--, understands the interrelationships of individuals and groups involved, and plans actions in light of these insights.

Hersey and Blanchard (1977) formulated a situational leadership theory which attempted to provide leaders with an understanding of the relationship between an effective style and the maturity of followers. The theory defined two broad categories of leader behavior:

> Task Behavior. The extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers) to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs accomplished.
>
> Relationship Behavior. The extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, "psychological strokes," and facilitating behaviors. (pp. 103-104)

Four basic leadership styles involving a combination of task behavior and relationship behavior were labeled as high task and low relationship, high task and high relationship, high relationship and low task, and low relationship and low task. When a leader would diagnose a situation in order to provide the appropriate kind of leadership while meeting the needs of followers and achieving the institution's goals, the style was considered effective. Thus, any given leadership style might be considered effective in one situation but ineffective in a different situation. The four effective leadership styles were described by Hersey and Blanchard (1977) as follows:

> High task/low relationship leader behavior is referred to as "telling" because this style is characterized by one-way communication in which the leader defines the roles of followers and tells them what, how, when, and where to do various tasks.
>
> High task/high relationship behavior is referred to as "selling" because with this style most of the direction is still provided by the leader. He or she also attempts through two-way communication

> and socioemotional support to get the follower(s) psychologically to buy into decisions that have to be made.
>
> High relationship/low task behavior is called "participating" because with this style the leader and follower(s) now share in decision making through two-way communication and much facilitating behavior from the leader since the follower(s) have the ability and knowledge to do the task.
>
> Low relationship/low task behavior is labeled "delegating" because the style involves letting follower(s) "run their own show" through delegation and general supervision since the follower(s) are high in both task and psychological maturity. (pp. 169-170)

Three factors in the situational leadership theory defined the maturity of followers as the capacity to set high but attainable goals, willingness and ability to take responsibility, and task-relevant education and/or experience of an individual or a group. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) emphasized that these variables should be considered only in relation to the task to be performed. Individuals or groups tend to be mature or immature in relation to a particular task, function, or objective the leader is attempting to accomplish through their efforts. Accordingly, it is important for a leader to be able to diagnose the maturity level of his or her subordinates in relationship to a task (based on the given definition of maturity), then adapt his or her leadership style to be effective.

Subordinate maturity can be plotted along a continuum from immature to mature with a leader concentrating on task-oriented behavior when subordinate maturity was very low for the task to be performed. As the maturity of the subordinate increased in terms of the specific task, the leader would reduce task-oriented behavior and increase relationship-oriented behavior until the individual or group reached a moderate maturity level. At that point a leader would decrease task behaviors but maintain relationship behaviors. Very mature subordinates would not need task-oriented behavior because they would have the ability to do the work nor

would these subordinates need relationship-oriented behavior because they would be self-confident and feel good about themselves.

The purpose of the study conducted by this writer was to compare the self-perceptions of North Dakota elementary principals' leadership styles; their range of leadership styles; and their leadership adaptability with their sex; age; education; amount of time they devoted to their principalship duties; the number of women teachers they supervised; the number of classrooms they supervised that used open space, were self-contained, or departmentalized; the number of students who were team taught; the type and size of community in which the school was located; their training in leadership; the number of years experience as a principal; and the number of years experience as a classroom teacher.

The Leader Effectiveness & Adaptability Description was used to gather data for making the comparisons. The LEAD Self was developed in the Center for Leadership Studies at Ohio University by Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard in 1973. It is designed to measure the self-perception of three aspects of leader behavior--style, style range, and style adaptability--based on the situational leadership theoretical model. The LEAD Self presents the participant with 12 hypothetical situations and four alternative actions which might be initiated by the responder. The four alternatives represented the high task/low relationship, high task/high relationship, high relationship/low task, and low relationship/low task styles. The greatest number of alternative choices associated with a particular leadership style determined a principal's dominant leadership style. A principal's style range--the extent to which the principal selected different style alternatives--included the principal's dominant leadership style in addition to the supporting leadership styles, those in which two or more responses were chosen by the principal from the LEAD Self.

A principal's style adaptability--the degree to which a principal used a style appropriate to a particular situation--was determined by scoring each alternative choice on a scale from -2 to +2 and calculating the total score. The range of scores possible on the adaptability dimension was -24 to +24.

Table 4 presents the dominant leadership styles of the 150 elementary principals in North Dakota who participated in the study.

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY OF DOMINANT LEADERSHIP STYLES AMONG NORTH DAKOTA ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

Dominant Style	Absolute Frequency	Percent of Total
No Single Dominant Style	21	14.0
High Task Low Relationship	5	3.3
High Task High Relationship	87	58.0
High Relationship Low Task	35	23.3
Low Relationship Low Task	2	1.3
TOTAL	150	99.9

Twenty-one (14%) principals had no single dominant leadership style. This suggests they had tied scores for two or more of the leadership styles that were measured. Eighty-seven (58%) of the principals had a dominant leadership style which demonstrated a high concern for task and a high concern for relationships. The second most prevalent dominant leadership

style demonstrated by 35 (23.3%) principals showed a high concern for relationships and a low concern for task. Five (3.3%) principals had a dominant leadership style which demonstrated a high concern for task and a low concern for relationships. Two (1.3%) principals had a dominant leadership style which showed a low concern for relationships and a low concern for task.

Table 5 presents the range of leadership styles demonstrated by the 150 elementary principals in the sample on the LEAD Self.

TABLE 5

FREQUENCY OF RANGE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES AMONG NORTH DAKOTA ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

Number of Styles	Absolute Frequency	Percent of Total
One Style	2	1.3
Two Styles	72	48.0
Three Styles	69	46.0
Four Styles	7	4.7
TOTAL	150	100.0

Table 5 shows that 72 (48%) of the principals had scores of two or more in two of the leadership categories. Sixty-nine (46%) had scores of two or more in three of the leadership style categories as measured by the LEAD Self. Seven (4.7%) had scores of two or more in all four of the leadership style categories, while two (1.3%) of the principals had a score of two or more for only one of the leadership style categories.

Table 6 presents the adaptability scores of the principals in the sample.

TABLE 6

FREQUENCY OF ADAPTABILITY OF LEADERSHIP STYLES AMONG NORTH DAKOTA ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

Adaptability Score	Absolute Frequency	Percent of Total
-4 to -1	3	2.1
0 to 3	11	7.4
4 to 7	35	23.3
8 to 11	50[a]	33.3
12 to 15	33	22.0
16 to 19	18	12.0
TOTAL	150	99.9

[a] $\bar{X} = 9.5$

The mean score for all principals was 9.5. Fifty (33.3%) of the principals had an adaptability score from 8 to 11. Thirty-five (23.3%) of the principals had adaptability scores of 4 to 7, and 33 (22%) of the principals had scores of 12 to 15. Eighteen (12%) of the principals had scores of 16 to 19, while 11 (7.4%) of the principals had scores of 0 to 3 and 3 (2.1%) of the principals had scores of -4 to -1.

For the purpose of comparison of the principals' leadership style, range, and adaptability and the selected demographic data, the chi square test for k independent samples, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance, the analysis of variance, and the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient were used. A significance of .05 was selected by the

writer as adequate for rejecting the hypothesis of no difference for each test.

An examination of the data revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between a principal's leadership style and the principal's experience as a teacher. Those principals who averaged the most experience as teachers had a low relationship and low task dominant leadership style. The group of principals who averaged the second most experience as teachers had a high task and low relationship dominant leadership style. This finding would suggest that the more experience a principal had as a teacher the less he or she was concerned with relationship-oriented leader behavior. However, this finding should be interpreted cautiously and may be due to several factors including (1) the very small number of principals in the sample who demonstrated a low relationship and low task leadership style; and (2) the individuals who demonstrated the low relationship and low task leadership style were principals who devoted, on the average, the least amount of time to their principalship duties. In light of these data perhaps these principals felt little need to develop relationships for accomplishing their administrative tasks since they had so little administrative time assigned.

Further examination of the data revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between a principal's leadership style adaptability and the principal's sex. The female principals in the sample population had an adaptability mean score of 10.56 and the male principals had an adaptability mean score of 8.53, suggesting that female principals were more adaptable in their leadership behaviors than were male principals. This may be due to the fact that women principals have spent, on the average, more years as classroom teachers where they learned to deal with students' individual differences and have applied this skill in dealing with different

situations involving adults as they carry out their leadership roles.

An examination of the data also revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the percentage of women teachers a principal supervised and a principal's leadership style adaptability. Principals who supervised "67% and over" women teachers had a mean adaptability score of 9.95 and principals who supervised "66% and under" women teachers had a mean adaptability score of 7.10, suggesting principals who supervised more women were able to adapt their leadership behaviors more effectively than principals who supervised fewer women teachers. This finding may be due to the fact that, on the basis of the data in this study, women appeared to be more adaptable themselves; thus, those principals who dealt with more women found themselves in situations which they were more or less forced to adapt their leadership style.

There was no statistically significant difference found between the principal's age and his or her leadership style, range, and adaptability. However, a majority of principals in North Dakota demonstrated a high task and high relationship leadership style. Apparently, principals tended to view themselves as people-oriented and job-oriented individuals. This may be due to the fact that the profession attracted people who related to others and who also worked to accomplish goals.

There was no statistically significant difference found between a principal's sex and his or her leadership style and range. The majority of both men and women principals demonstrated a high concern for accomplishing tasks and a high concern for relationships in their leadership roles. Most men and women principals had either two or three leadership styles they could use in a particular situation.

There was no statistically significant difference found between the amount of education principals had and their leadership style, range, and adaptability. Apparently, leadership behaviors were not a result of coursework for educational degrees.

There was no statistically significant difference found between the size and type of community in which the school is located and the principal's leadership style, range, and adaptability. Seemingly, the fact that principals may be dealing with people who come from different sizes and types of communities with differing perspectives did not affect their leadership style, range, or adaptability.

There was no statistically significant difference found between the amount of time a principal devoted to principalship duties and the principal's leadership style, range, and adaptability. However, the principals who spent a greater percentage of their time carrying out their duties as principals tended to demonstrate a higher concern for relationships. This may be due to the fact that they spent more time in dealing with people in the course of performing the leadership function as a principal and that principals who devoted less time to their principalship duties were more concerned with accomplishing the management functions in their role as principals.

There was no statistically significant difference found between the percentage of women teachers a principal supervised and the principal's leadership style and range. Apparently, the sexual makeup of the instructional staff does not affect the leadership behaviors used most often by an elementary principal or the extent to which he or she varies the style from one situation to another.

There was no statistically significant difference found between the percentage of classrooms that used open space, were team taught, were

self-contained, or were departmentalized and the principal's leadership style, range, and adaptability. Apparently, the way a school was organized for instruction did not affect the way a principal related to staff members in accomplishing tasks. Principals who supervised a greater percentage of classrooms using open space and team teaching did demonstrate a tendency toward a leadership style showing high concern for people and a low concern for task. This may be due to the fact that teachers in such situations were given more responsibility for management tasks commonly performed by the principal.

There was no statistically significant difference found between a principal's training in leadership and the principal's leadership style, range, and adaptability. However, principals who had not had training in leadership were found to have a greater facility for adaptability than principals who had had leadership training. Apparently, principals who have had training become less adaptable as a result of their training in leadership. Perhaps the training they received emphasized one style as "best" and the principal was behaving in that one way in most situations.

There was no statistically significant difference between the number of years experience as a principal and the principal's leadership style, range, and adaptability. Apparently, principals' leadership behaviors were not a result of more experience as a principal.

There was no statistically significant difference between the number of years experience as a teacher and a principal's leadership range and adaptability. Seemingly, the number of styles a principal can use effectively does not result from his or her teaching experience.

In analyzing the data it was clear that North Dakota elementary principals perceived themselves in very much the same way. In all categories

that were studied the majority of principals demonstrated a high concern for people. This finding may be due to the kind of tasks that principals were assigned. They seemingly were more involved in the growth and development of students and teachers. Then, too, principals may be expressing what they consider to be the expectation of others (parents, superintendents, teachers, students) who had a vested interest in their job.

Only seven of the 150 principals in the sample demonstrated a low concern for people as it related to their leadership role as a principal. These principals were most likely to be females in rural areas who spent the least amount of time, on the average, devoted to their principalship duties. They tended to either have the greatest number or least number of years experience as principals and averaged the greatest number of years experience as teachers.

The study of leadership is a complex and often baffling one. However, there is a challenge and excitement in the achievement of goals through effective leadership. Campbell (1980) stated it best when he wrote:

> . . . But many people with twenty years of experience simply repeat one year's experience twenty times, they make no forward progress because the second and third steps--creativity and leadership--require more energy. These steps are worth it though, because the dessert course in life comes from thinking up ways to change, improve, and expand that portion of the world you are experienced in, and then making new things happen. The results are pleasant--a sense of growth, greater freedom, a feeling of relevance, a belief that what you do matters--and that is heady wine. Making a living is necessary and often satisfying; eventually making a difference becomes more important. (p. 25)

Our educational leaders do make a difference. As Betz (1981) stated, "Leadership must help create the conditions under which excellence can thrive in our society" (p. 95).

Should data concerning the elementary principal of North Dakota be of interest copies of the study, "Comparisons of Leadership Styles, Ranges, and Adaptability Based on Selected Demographic Variables Among North Dakota Elementary School Principals," are available from University of North Dakota Center for Teaching and Learning Independent Study Library; University of North Dakota Phi Delta Kappa's George Reavis Reading Room; North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals; North Dakota Council of School Administrators; University of North Dakota Bureau of Educational Research and Services; North Dakota Department of Public Instruction; and Ann Porter, Benjamin Franklin Elementary School, Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

The writers are submitting a set of recommendations for consideration based on the findings of the studies about the elementary principalship in North Dakota. The recommendations will clearly be of interest to elementary principals. They will likely be of interest to superintendents, school board members, Department of Public Instruction personnel, and college and university faculty who are involved in the preparation of professional educators. Professional education associations will likely find the recommendations of interest and may wish to use them in framing policy or in making decisions about association programming or directions. There are some citizens who have a special interest in schools who may also find the recommendations helpful.

The writers offer the following recommendations for action:

1. It is recommended that all talented personnel whose undergraduate training is in elementary education and who show leadership promise should be encouraged to seek further training in educational administration at the elementary level preparatory to career advancement.

2. It is recommended that principals be encouraged to pursue the highest degree and/or credential feasible. This is based on the presumption that additional training impacts positively on effectiveness. It is assumed that North Dakota educators and citizens want the best possible schooling for their children and that effective leadership helps achieve this goal.

3. It is recommended that female educators specifically be recruited from the talent pool of teacher leaders and encouraged to seek training for the elementary school principalship. School boards and superintendents need to be encouraged to employ talented, trained women as elementary principals.

4. It is recommended that school boards and school superintendents take a leadership role in eliminating inequities for women principals. These include such things as lower salaries, unequal opportunities, lesser assignment of duties. Such action would eliminate the need and the potential for women administrators to unify as a polit' al force and attempt to gain parity and equity through the legislative process.

5. It is recommended that due care be taken to assure the elimination of inequities and race bias which may face ethnic minority principals, particularly those in North Dakota of American Indian heritage, whether it be in equal opportunity or salary.

6. It is recommended that secondary-trained administrators now working in elementary schools be expected to verify their competence and knowledge of elementary education or be required to be adequately retrained in elementary education.

7. It is recommended that principals and teachers in North Dakota become more familiar with and consider the merits of the various organizational patterns for schools and implement those that will most effectively meet the needs of students.

8. It is recommended that principals in North Dakota actively plan for change in their schools and promote an increase in the involvement of others in decision making, problem solving, and conflict resolution.

9. It is recommended that the North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals takes an active role in instructional leadership by promoting supervision and inservice education for faculty which will lead to the improvement of instruction and curriculum.

10. It is recommended that the North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals takes an active role in the training of principals in a variety of leadership models.

11. It is recommended that the North Dakota Association of Elementary School Principals continues to support research in the area of leadership in the elementary school.

The writers offer the following recommendations for further study:

1. It is recommended that the studies of the principalship be replicated with a population sample that includes a corresponding percentage of men and women principals in North Dakota to their actual number in the state.

2. It is recommended that the studies of the principalship be replicated in other states for comparison with the North Dakota principalship.

3. It is recommended that because of the prevalence and complexity of changes occurring in elementary schools, further study using a wide range of additional variables be conducted relating to the elementary principalship.

4. It is recommended that further study be done in the area of financial alternatives for the schools since finances and economics affect the role of the principal and the manner in which s/he can fulfill that role.

5. It is recommended that the studies of the principalship be replicated using the perceptions of others, such as teachers, superintendents,

and school board members, in describing the principalship.

6. It is recommended that further study be conducted about the leadership style, range, and adaptability of individuals in other occupations for comparisons with North Dakota elementary principals' leadership style, range, and adaptability.

Four other studies were done concurrently on different aspects of the elementary principalship in North Dakota. Three of these were done using the same population sample. A fourth study was done using a different sample. It is the final recommendation of the writers that persons interested in a more complete picture of the elementary principalship in North Dakota should read all these studies. These studies are (a) "Prototypic Descriptions of the Elementary Principal in North Dakota," Isabel Hovel, University of North Dakota, 1982 (same sample); (b) "A Descriptive Study of the North Dakota Principalship," Jeanette Lindquist, University of North Dakota, 1982 (same sample); (c) "Comparisons of Leadership Styles, Ranges, and Adaptability Based on Selected Demographic Variables Among North Dakota Elementary School Principals," Ann W. Porter, University of North Dakota, 1982 (same sample); (d) "A Description of the Elementary Principal and School Districts in Rural and Geographically Isolated Schools in North Dakota," Janet Pladson, University of North Dakota, 1982 (different sample). Sources from which the studies can be obtained are listed at the end of chapters two, three, and four.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Abramowitz, Susan, and Tenenbaum, Ellen. High School '77 A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, 1978.

Betz, Don. Cultivating Leadership: An Approach. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, Inc., 1981.

Campbell, David. If I'm in charge here why is everybody laughing? Allen, Texas: Argus Communications, 1980.

Gallup, George H. "Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (September 1980): 33-48.

Hersey, Paul, and Blanchard, Kenneth H. Leader Effectiveness & Adaptability Description. San Diego: Learning Resources Corporation, 1973.

_____. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Hovel, Isabel. "Prototypic Description of the Elementary Principal of North Dakota." Master of Education research paper, University of North Dakota, 1982.

Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Lindquist, Jeanette. "A Descriptive Study of the North Dakota Principalship." Master of Education research paper, University of North Dakota, 1982.

Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C. Hadlai; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin; and Bent, Dale H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1975.

Pharis, William, and Zakariya, Salley. "Elementary School Principalship in 1978." Reston, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1979.

Porter, Ann W. "Comparisons of Leadership Styles, Ranges, and Adaptability Based on Selected Demographic Variables Among North Dakota Elementary School Principals." Master of Education research paper, University of North Dakota, 1982.

Zimmerman, Delmar D. "Elementary School Principalship in North Dakota." Master of Science research paper, North Dakota State University, 1968.